

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration. New claims 6-11 are presented. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the new claims are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1 (and dependent claims 2-4) and independent claim 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Rode (US2002/0007409).

The rejections are traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 5 respectively recite, a server for performing a process in compliance with a request from a client, and a program causing a computer to function as, using claim 1 as an example "affixing means for affixing confirmation information for confirming display status of the client side to a result of process performed by said processing means; storing means for storing the confirmation information affixed by said affixing means; . . . extracting means, responsive to a request made again from the client, for extracting the confirmation information included in the request; determining means for determining whether or not the confirmation information extracted by said extracting means coincides with the confirmation information stored in said storing means; and withholding means for withholding a process performed by the said processing means in compliance with the request if it is judged by said determining means that the two sets of confirmation information do not coincide."

Applicants submit that the recited features are not taught by the art relied on by the Examiner.

On page 2 entitled Response to Arguments, the Examiner mistakenly contends that Rode teaches "affixing confirmation information for confirming display status of the client side to a result of process" by teaching displaying a new page indicating that processing "is taking place, accompanied by updated account information (in a "cookie")."

However, according to aspects of the present invention as recited in the claims, upon a client making a request to a server, the server confirms the display status of the client side by "affixing confirmation information for confirming display status," for example, a confirming serial number. The "cookie" as taught by Rode does not teach confirming the display status.

On pages 2-4, entitled Response to Arguments, the Examiner mistakenly contends that Rode teaches a server including "storing means for storing the confirmation information affixed by said affixing means" by teaching:

Rode on [0036] Systems, methods and computer media instructions are disclosed that enable the storage or caching of server account information on a client by clients that have a mechanism for the storage . . . Storing account information on the client implies it need not be stored on the server.

Even assuming the Examiner's contentions are correct, independent claims 1 and 5 recite a server including the storing means, not the client.

On page 6, the Examiner mistakenly contends that "withholding means for withholding a process performed by the said processing means in compliance with the request if it is judged by said determining means that the two sets of confirmation information do not coincide" is taught by Rode paragraphs [0091]-[0093]. However, Rode merely discusses use of "preventing a same cookie from being resubmitted, a timestamp is encoded."

Conclusion

Since features are not taught by the cited art, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-5 allowed.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

Applicant's representative requested an interview from the Examiner including providing an Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form describing issues for discussion to further speed prosecution of the present application.

However, after repeated inquires, the Examiner indicated that a conduct of an interview was in doubt as a response from a Primary Examiner regarding the interview had not been received.

Applicants respectfully request an interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor before issuance of a next action to expedite prosecution.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 6-11 recite features of the present invention in an alternate fashion.

New claims 6-9 recite a method for performing a process on a first computer in compliance with a request from a client using a second computer, including "upon receiving a second request from the same client, extracting confirmation information included in the request; determining whether the extracted confirmation information coincides with the stored affixed confirmation information; and upon determining that the affixed confirmation does not coincide with the stored confirmation information not performing the process."

New claims 10-11 recite a method for preventing a client, using a first computer to place an order with a second computer, from being charged a second time for the order including

"comparing the received affixed tracking information with the stored tracking information; upon the affixed tracking information coinciding with the stored tracking information, processing the order; and modifying the stored tracking information."

These, and other, features of claims 6-11 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and they are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 29, 2005

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501